



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,291	01/22/2001	Joe W. Gray	02307O-175400US	9405
20350 7590 01/25/2011 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			EXAMINER BRUSCA, JOHN S	
			ART UNIT 1631	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 01/25/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docket@kilpatricktownsend.com  
ipefiling@kilpatricktownsend.com  
jlhice@kilpatrick.foundationip.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/765,291	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GRAY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> John S. Brusca	<b>Art Unit</b> 1631	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John S. Brusca (USPTO). (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Jean Lockyer. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 19 January 2011.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 137 and 149.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent No. 6,576,421 and Ribeiro et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicants asked whether claim 149 should have been rejected for obviousness type double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 6,576,421. The examiner reviewed the Final Office action mailed 03 September 2010 and stated:

1) The specification defines a Philadelphia chromosome on page 14 as having a reciprocal translocation on chromosomes 9 and 22 that is further limited to have sites of translocation that are t(9;22)(q34;q11). Therefore instant claim 149 is limited to probes that detect a Philadelphia chromosome and instant claim 137 is limited to probes that detect a t(9;22)(q34;q11) translocation and the two claims have overlapping if not identical scope.

2) Review of the claims in U.S. Patent No. 6,576,421 shows only claim 10 is limited to a specific translocation site, however claim 10 recites a translocation that is t(9;22)(q11;q34) which is different than the translocation of instant claims 137 and 149. The examiner noted that claim 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,576,421 might contain a typographical error and that a certificate of correction could be considered by the applicants.

3) Since no claim of U.S. Patent No. 6,576,421 is limited to an embodiment of a Philadelphia chromosome as defined in the instant specification (having a t(9;22)(q34;q11) reciprocal translocation) the rejection of claim 137 for obviousness type double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 6,576,421 would be withdrawn if an Office action is issued subsequent to this interview summary.

4) The applicants asked whether an amendment in which the limitation of claim 137 or 149 were added to the independent claims would overcome the entire obviousness type double patenting rejection over U.S. Patent No. 6,576,421. The examiner stated that the rejection over U.S. Patent No. 6,576,421 would be withdrawn in that event, however it would be likely that a new obviousness type double patenting rejection (which could have been made in the Office action mailed 03 September 2010 over claims 137 and 149) would be raised over U.S. Patent No. 6,576,421 concerning at least claim 11 of the issued patent drawn to a method of detecting a BCR-ABL translocation in view of Ribiero et al. (of record in the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)), since Ribiero et al. shows a Philadelphia chromosome containing a t(9;22)(q34;q11) translocation involving the ABL gene. An office action containing that new grounds of rejection could not be a final Office action because the new grounds of rejection could have been made in the Office action mailed 03 September 2010. .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO

FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/John S. Brusca/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1631

**Summary of Record of Interview Requirements****Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record**

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

**Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews**

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

**Examiner to Check for Accuracy**

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.